

Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture and Conservation (PARCC) Plan Update 2016

Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>1. Provide information about how the City arrived at setting an 80% LOS standard for outdoor sports facilities. (Nichols)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> (12/14/16) Level of Service Standards for Outdoor Sports Fields: Why would the City wait until a field is at 80% capacity before expanding capacity? Where does the 80% capacity standard for sports field usage come from? During the discussion, Commissioners observed that waiting until a field is being used at 80% capacity seems late to begin planning for a capacity expansion project. Commissioners also inquired about the basis of the 80% capacity standard. Staff provided the written response below.</p> <p>(1/11/17) Commissioners observed that many fields are operating at a use rate much lower than 80% yet the demand for more field capacity seems to be evident. The LOS Rating System for Facilities table was presented which describes how capacity expansion projects are scheduled out depending on the capacity they are operating at. Staff explained that as the rate of use of a facility increases, a project to increase capacity moves up to the near-term. An example was given of a field operating between 11% and 30% would have a capacity increase project completed within 20 years. The proposed level of service standard sets 80% capacity as a maximum to indicate an expansion project is of high priority. Staff provided other examples of how field capacity can be expanded through a variety of means including partnering with Lake Washington School District, converting grass fields to artificial turf or lining fields for multiple sports. After discussion Commissioners were satisfied with the information provided and staff's suggestion to add a table to Chapter 4 regarding the level of serving rating system for facility use.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> (12/28/16) The capacity percent is an indicator of the demand for fields in the community. When demand is high, indicated by a high capacity percent – 80% or higher, a capital project for increasing field capacity should be planned and implemented within 6 years. The recommended timeframe for a capital project lengthens when capacity percent is lower, as shown in the table below. This is part of the recreation facilities level of service methodology developed in the 2010 PARCC Plan and a similar table could be included with the 2016 PARCC Plan.</p> <p>Cities are encouraged by the National Recreation and Parks Association (NRPA) and state agency, Washington Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), to create levels of service appropriate for their communities. In 2009-2010, staff from park planning, park operations and recreation developed this standard based on the amount of field use and the growing trends within the sports on that field.</p>	<p>Closed 1/11/17</p>

Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture and Conservation (PARCC) Plan Update 2016

Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status																		
	<p>Essentially, if a field is rented or programmed 80% of the time, there is little time left for additional rentals as there needs to be adequate time to switch fields and provide maintenance. Staff felt that 80% capacity showed sufficient demand and provided planning time to develop a new field or find additional space locally. This standard is part of the 2010 PARCC Plan and in 2010, RCO approved this level of service methodology.</p> <p>Subsequently, the RCO developed a similar recommendation for a level of service, “Facility Capacity: Percent of demand met by existing facilities”. It shows that if there is less than 30% capacity available, it is level E (failing).</p> <p>Exhibit from 2010 PARCC Plan</p> <p><i>Exhibit 7-18: LOS Rating System for Facilities</i></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="420 641 1060 1071"> <thead> <tr> <th>Capacity (percent use)</th><th>LOS Rating</th><th>Estimated Timeframe for Capital Project</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>81-100</td><td>E</td><td>2-4 yr. CIP</td></tr> <tr> <td>51-80</td><td>D</td><td>6 yr. CIP</td></tr> <tr> <td>31-50</td><td>C</td><td>10 yr. PIP</td></tr> <tr> <td>11-30</td><td>B</td><td>20 yr.</td></tr> <tr> <td><10</td><td>A</td><td>20 yr.</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p><i>References:</i> 2016 PARCC Plan, Chapter 4, p. 33-34, 39-40. Washington Recreation and Conservation Office, Manual 2, Planning Policies and Guidelines, February 1, 2014</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	Capacity (percent use)	LOS Rating	Estimated Timeframe for Capital Project	81-100	E	2-4 yr. CIP	51-80	D	6 yr. CIP	31-50	C	10 yr. PIP	11-30	B	20 yr.	<10	A	20 yr.	
Capacity (percent use)	LOS Rating	Estimated Timeframe for Capital Project																		
81-100	E	2-4 yr. CIP																		
51-80	D	6 yr. CIP																		
31-50	C	10 yr. PIP																		
11-30	B	20 yr.																		
<10	A	20 yr.																		

Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture and Conservation (PARCC) Plan Update 2016

Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>2. What is the method used to define service areas LOS? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> (12/14/16) Service areas level of service method: Clearly describe the method used to define service areas and the radii used to create them. Commissioner Miller expressed concern that applying large service areas may disguise/overlook critical needs. Commissioner Miller observed that ½ mi service area radius for a neighborhood park like Spiritbrook Park seemed rather far.</p> <p>(1/11/17) Commissioners continued to discuss this topic, considering staff’s description of how the service area method had been applied providing details and showing maps and results of the analysis. Commissioners observed that that application of national service area standards may not transfer to Redmond and that using a larger radii may result in missing some local needs. It was discussed that small service area radii result in an identified need for more facilities and conversely large radii result in fewer. For the analysis research-based service area radii lengths were selected to right-size the list of projects for expanding the system. While Commissioners expressed some uncertainty regarding the radii length, they agreed that the issue be closed.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> (12/28/16) The 2015 PARCC Plan Survey asked respondents about their willingness to walk various distances to parks and trails:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 64% said it is important or very important that they can walk one-quarter mile to a local park • 45% walk and 10% bike, while 45% drive to their most frequently used Redmond parks • 55% said it is important or very important that local parks have play features and small sports courts for fitness <p>These data and many community conversations on this topic helped form the revised level of service approach using service areas for play features, fitness features, and trails.</p> <p>Staff considered the size of the service area carefully, even after receiving this survey data. Staff wanted to ensure that all residents have easy access to parks, which led to the half mile service area for parks with fewer features and a mile service area for parks with many features. These service areas are similar or smaller than those in past parks functional plans and from what has been recommended by the state agency. For example, in 2004, community parks had a one mile service area and neighborhood parks had a half-mile service area. The Washington Recreation and Conservation Office 2014 Planning Policies and</p>	<p>Closed 1/11/17</p>

Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture and Conservation (PARCC) Plan Update 2016

Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Guidelines propose service areas of 5 miles for community parks and half a mile for neighborhood parks. Within the planning profession, a quarter mile to one mile walk is considered a feasible walking distance for most people. Further, a quarter mile to half mile service area is used for transit and land use planning by many leading organizations including the Urban Land Institute, National Recreation and Parks Association, American Planning Association, and Trust for Public Land. Lastly, City Council adopted a dashboard measure related to this policy goal last year, which is:</p> <p>Indicator 6: Walkability – Percent of population with convenient access to parks and trails (ability to walk less than ¼ mile to a park or a trail from home or office).</p> <p><u>Measure Description:</u> Percent of population with convenient access to parks and trails (ability to walk less than ¼ mile to a park or trail from home or office).</p> <p><u>Importance:</u> Easy access to outdoor recreation is an essential element of what makes Redmond a great place to live, play, work and invest.</p> <p>At the 1/11/17 meeting, staff will supply service area maps from the 2016 PARCC Plan and provide additional information regarding implications of the LOS method.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> (1/11/17)</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
<p>3. What is the relationship between cost recovery and social equity? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> (12/14/16) Recreation Policy, Cost Recovery: Commissioners inquired what the relationship is between cost recovery and social equity. Commissioners expressed concern that well intentioned cost recovery policies may unintentionally undercut policies that support/promote equitable access to park services.</p> <p>(1/11/17) Commissioners considered the additional information that staff provided at the meeting on this item, including that the City’s goal is to achieve a balanced approach where higher skill programs generate revenue where entry level and drop-in programs are more subsidized. After considering the information provided by staff, Commissioners agreed with the explanation and also reiterated the importance of ensuring the recreation needs of the local residents are met. Commissioners agreed to close the issue without recommending a change.</p>	<p>Closed 1/11/17</p>

Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture and Conservation (PARCC) Plan Update 2016

Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> (12/28/16)</p> <p>The specific policy being discussed is the proposed PR-33 from the proposed section E. Funding Strategies, of the PARCC Element of the Comprehensive Plan, “Establish and implement financial goals, cost recovery targets, and a subsidy allocation model to inform recreation program decision making.”</p> <p>The City provides a wide variety of recreation programming with the goal of being inclusive, affordable and community focused, per proposed policy PR 35. The municipal recreational model that Redmond is committed to is to serve all people regardless of their ability to pay and to be the gateway to recreation for our community members. The City has and will continue to maintain affordable fees and scholarships for those who are unable to pay. The goal of policy PR 33 is to develop a funding model that reduces the amount of City subsidy for recreation programming through multiple strategies, cost recovery being one of them. A cost recovery model shows how a recreation program can meet their financial goals with some programs generating revenue and others being subsidized. This work is ongoing and the Parks & Trails Commission and City Council will be engaged as the work progresses.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
<p>4. Does the City consider connector trails as parks or transportation facilities managed by the Park dept.? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> (12/14/16)</p> <p>Land Use and trails: Commissioners expressed concern that the City should be aware of the implications (e.g. zoning, state regulations) of managing new transportation facilities, such as the RCC, and its impact on siting other uses. The example given was the potential impacts on siting future retail cannabis stores relative to trails vs. parks.</p> <p>(1/11/17)</p> <p>Commissioners continued discussion on this issue considering staff’s description of the new park classification categories introduced in the proposed PARCC Plan. The new classification of Trail Corridor allows the City to address issues of land use, as noted above, and to plan for the type of facilities a property will be developed with. Commissioners were satisfied with the information provided and closed this issue.</p>	<p>Closed 1/11/17</p>

Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture and Conservation (PARCC) Plan Update 2016

Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> (12/28/16) Redmond recently amended the Zoning Code for retail marijuana uses. Per RZC 21.41, marijuana retailers must maintain a buffer of 1,000 feet from playgrounds and 100 feet from public parks and recreation centers or facilities. There are no buffers from trails.</p> <p>A portion of the Redmond Central Connector (RCC) in the Downtown is considered a linear park in the RCC master plan and by City Council direction due to the nature of the use and improvements to this portion of the RCC. Other portions of the RCC Downtown including future phases are not considered parks. The recommended PARCC Plan shows the one block area of the Redmond Central Connector between Leary Way and 161st Ave NE as a park, due to its design and use as a park space. This is consistent with the RCC master plan and City Council's direction.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
<p>5. What is the rationale for expanding new acquisitions while the aging senior center has maintenance issues to be addressed? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> (12/14/16): Prioritizing deferred maintenance vs. new acquisition of priority: Commissioner Miller recommended adding another Key Strategy centered on prioritizing deferred maintenance items. The context included mention of the building maintenance needs at the Senior Center in contrast to the goals and plans for new acquisitions proposed in the PARCC Plan.</p> <p>(1/11/17) Commissioners stated the need for due diligence in maintenance as well as identifying new needs. Staff described that asset management is a high priority for the City and listed the sections of the PARCC Plan that address it. Staff also proposed to add some emphasis to this issue in the document in some way. After the discussion, Commissioners were satisfied with the information and agreed to close the issue with the understanding that staff would further highlight this topic in the proposed plan.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> (12/28/16) There are a variety of recreation needs and demands from the community that the City plans to address. The community and staff place high value on maintaining existing facilities and structures. Staff will propose</p>	<p>Closed 1/11/17</p>

Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture and Conservation (PARCC) Plan Update 2016

Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>a way to further highlight this idea in the Plan. The proposed new Maintenance and Operations chapter and policy section are intended to provide more focus on these issues. This chapter also provides a small capital projects list which are prioritized separately from other capital projects and with a focus on maintenance and asset preservation (Ch. 7 Maintenance & Operations). The department attempts to fund a selection of these projects every year. The capital project ranking criteria were developed to prioritize asset preservation and safety, which are weighted more than other criteria and have resulted in prioritizing the Senior Center repairs, playground replacement and farmstead restoration (Ch. 10 Capital Projects). The Parks and Recreation Department is also coordinating with the Public Works Department on the citywide Facilities Strategic Plan, which is being developed to prioritize the management of all City buildings including short and long term capital investments.</p> <p>Other sections of the proposed Plan that address prioritizing maintenance projects are Ch. 3, policy PR-4 and PR-64; Ch. 8.7.1 Developing CIP Project List.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	